DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 408 CE 017 748

TITLE Impacts of YEDPA on Education/CETA Relationships at the Local Level. Five Case Studies. Office of Youth Programs Special Report Number 1.

INSTITUTION Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.; Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Youth Programs.

PUB DATE Aug 78

NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Administrative Problems; Case Studies; Community Programs; Educational Assessment; Educational Finance; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Financial Problems; Government School Relationship; *Interagency Cooperation; Job Training; Program Administration; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; School Community Cooperation; *School Community Programs; Time; Training Allowances; *Youth Programs

IDENTIFIERS California (Los Angeles); Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Local Education Agencies; Massachusetts (Worcester); Minnesota; Texas (Houston); United States; Virginia (Fairfax County); Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act; Youth Employment and Training Programs

ABSTRACT

Five Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)/Local Education Agency (LEA) programs designed to provide youth with employment-related services were reviewed. Onsite visits were conducted to assess program development and implementation in Houston, Worcester (Massachusetts), Minnesota, Fairfax County (Virginia), and Los Angeles. (Each area review is reported in depth.) A summary of the reviews found that (1) the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) has contributed to improved CETA communications with the public schools; (2) YEDPA provides opportunities for the education and employment/training communities to have substantial impact on the quality of education and training for youth; (3) the cooperativeness of previous relationships, community size, and degree of prior preparation contributed to CETA/LEA program development; (4) lack of time for comprehensive program planning affected most sites; (5) the Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP) reaches students who would not otherwise be served; (6) program regulations hinder broad exposure of youth to private sector job opportunities; (7) school requirements (such as credit, scheduling, etc.) deserve more attention; and (8) most school and prime sponsor officials felt more money was required to meet deserving youth needs. (CSS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED159408

# U.S. Department of Labor

## Employment and Training Administration
## Office of Youth Programs
## Washington, D.C.

Impacts of YEDPA on Education/CETA Relationships at the Local Level: Five Case Studies

August 1978

Prepared Jointly by Representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Office of Youth Programs, Department of Labor

Office of Youth Programs Special Report Number 1

CE 017 748

## An Overview

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) seeks to improve cooperation and coordination between the education and employment and training systems in order to better integrate work and education, to improve the quality of in-school programs, to encourage school completion and to ease the transition from school to work.

Under the Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP) section of YEDPA, which provides funds to Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors throughout the country to provide comprehensive services for youth, specific linkages are mandated. Not less than 22 percent of the funds allocated under YETP to each prime sponsors is to be used for programs for in-school youth under the terms of agreements between prime sponsors and local education agencies. Further, the law states that no program of work experience for in-school youth shall be supported under YETP unless there is an agreement which shall "set forth assurances that participating youths will be provided meaningful work experience, which will improve their ability to make career decisions and which will provide them with basic work skills needed for regular employment."

The regulations further delineate this mandate by defining LEA's and outlining broad parameters for these agreements. The local education agency is defined as "a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control over, direction of, or service to public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district or other potential subdivision of a State."

Sincee these agreements are a new institutional feature and the format is not specified in the law, the regulations leave considerable flexibility. Prime sponsors with more than one LEA have the responsibility for allocating funds among them. The prime may work with only one, or several LEA's independently, or a consortium. The agreements may be financial or nonfinancial.

The format for the agreements is relatively open-ended. They are to describe activities, services, and delivery approaches, to guarantee that there will be no substitution for existing funding, to assure that job information, counseling, guidance and placement services are provided with any work experience activity, and where possible, to provide a policy framework for the awarding of academic credit for competencies derived from work experience. A technical assistance guide was prepared to suggest some possible considerations and elements for CETA/LEA agreements. This was the result of extensive consultation with educators and officials in HEW. To provide an incentive for cooperation, $15 million of YETP discretionary funds were also set aside for competitive grants to prime sponsors for exemplary in-school programs.

The effectiveness of YETP in promoting coordination and cooperation at the local level between the education and employment and training systems, as well as YETP's impact on in-school programs, are being assessed from a number of perspectives:

1. YETP and YCCIP programs are being studied in a sample of prime sponsor areas on a continuing basis. LEA/CETA relationships are a major focus of the case studies. These provide descriptive and analytic information covering a range of local conditions.

2. A stratified sample of fiscal 1978 LEA/CETA agreements are being assessed to determine their content and to develop a model agreement format.

3. LEA/CETA relations are being analyzed under studies being contracted by HEW in coordination with DOL.

4. Linkage problems will be assessed by the National Association of State Boards of Education under YEDPA funding.

To supplement these assessments and to provide detailed information in a timely fashion, the Department of Labor's Office of Youth Programs and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Office of Education participated in onsite reviews of CETA/LEA programs in five locations. Site visits were conducted in April 1977, 8 months after the signing of YEDPA and approximately 4 months after program startup. Sites of varying program quality were selected to look at what happened with respect to development and implementation of youth programs pursuant to CETA/LEA agreements. The major question was why some communities were successful and others were not in promoting institional change.

Based on the very limited reviews, global comments cannot be made with validity, and the following summary of impressions and findings must be considered very tentative:

1. In the five areas studied, YEDPA has contributed to improved CETA communication with the public schools. In some cases, YEDPA has provided the impetus for the communication. Even in cases where relationships were already well established, linkages have been intensified. Four months after program startup, many of the initial apprehensions about the leverage, role and impact of prime sponsors on school programs had subsided.

2. YEDPA provides a great opportunity for the education and employment/training communities to have substantial impact on the quality of education and training for youth. In the small sample reviewed, several prime sponsors had made or at least initiated significant improvements in program quality, based on cooperation and coordination.

3. As might be expected, the cooperativeness of previous relationships, the size of the community, and the degree of prior preparation contributed to what happened in the development of CETA/LEA programs. It appears that smaller communities where staff on both sides were familiar with each other and where new program ideas had been developed but not implemented, generated the more innovative programs.

4. The lack of time for comprehensive planning and program development affected most sites. Haste affected the quality of agreements and programs. There were delays in the implementation of efforts which departed from traditional policies. There has been an evolutionary process in the months since YEDPA's implementation.

5. YETP is reaching students who would not otherwise be served. The case studies suggest that existing in-school programs linking education and work would sometimes screen out all disadvantaged youth and certainly do not reach the universe of need. The ability to hire additional school counselors and staff has contributed to the ability of schools to offer services to additional youth, particularly transitional services for students who are not college-bound. Of course, the overall number of disadvantaged youth being served in in-school programs has increased with the advent of YETP. Most school officials would like

to see even broader coverage of these students.

6. Program regulations hinder the broad exposure of youth to private sector job opportunities. Most schools offer some vocational training and work experience programs for students. Some states even require that schools train students in a skill before graduation. Many of these existing programs utilize the private sector, but if they do, they frequently "cream" from the eligible population to find youth most likely to be accepted by private employers. The private sector usually offers greater opportunities for placement after graduation. If work experience is to continue for in-school participants, more consideration should be given to opening up private sector work experience opportunities under YETP.

7. The areas of academic credit, scheduling, extended school day, vacation and graduation requirements deserve much more attention. Many opportunities for youth are missed because of administrative restraints. Because of the wide variation in State and local laws, school administrators and principals, it is difficult to generalize except to suggest that much more could be accomplished if school regulations were relaxed. In many instances, it appears that school principals and staff are not certain about legal requirements, particularly academic credit for work experience and can do more to encourage and institute changes which would benefit all students.

8. Generally, most school and prime sponsor officials felt that more money was required to meet the needs of all deserving youth. Local education agencies felt that the 22 percent setaside limited their ability to negotiate for funds. Other prime sponsors wanted greater flexibility in use of funds. While a setaside of some amount appears to be useful in facilitating cooperation and coordination of programs, it has some limitations. It seems that LEA's must demonstrate effectiveness in program implementation to be in a position of greater bargaining leverage with prime sponsors.

The case studies which follow provide insights into the types of changes which are occurring at the local level. They represent the results of 2-day site visits by a two member team--one from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and one from the Office of Youth Programs, Department of Labor. In all the sites, a standare interview instrument was used. There were interviews with CETA and LEA staff at all levels, particularly school officials involved in career information, alternate education programs and occupational training, as well as vocational educators. Worksite supervisors and participants were also interviewed. The aim was to distill a variety of perspectives on local developments and to assess them from an interagency viewpoint. Not surprisingly, there is a great deal of variability within and between sites. However, there is no question that change is occurring, that it is substantial in some cases, and that it is in the directions desired by the authors of YETP.

## 1. Providing the Impetus for Major Change: CETA/LEA Youth Programs in Houston

### The Prime Sponsor and the Local Education Agency

The city of Houston is a major urban area of 1.2 million people with a relatively low overall unemployment rate of 4.5 percent. However, the unemployment rate for minorities is 11.0 and for youth it is almost 30.0 percent. A large Mexican-American population resides in Houston as well.

Over the past several years, Houston has experienced tremendous growth and development. Approximately 1,000 new comers arrive in Houston weekly. To date, no major steps have been taken to curb this population expansion.

Within the city of Houston, there are 5 good school districts. The largest is the Houston Independent School District (HISD) which has the only contract with the CETA program for YEDPA. The other 4 school districts -- North Forest, Spring Branch, Aldine and Aleif -- subcontract with HISD for 20% of the YETP program funds. The total school age youth population between the ages of 16-21 is estimated to be 161,000. Of this total, 90,000 are youth unattached to the school system and 71,000 are in-school students. The average daily school attendance is 85 percent. In addition, of the 161,000 youth, 34,000 are considered poverty youth and a total of 43,500 are below 85% of the lower living standard. Therefore, nearly 30% of the high school age youth are eligible to participate in YEDPA youth programs.

Prior to YEDPA, the schools and never contracted with the city's CETA programs. Nevertheless, the schools were subcontracted portions of the Title I, VI and Title III SPEDY programs from the Neighborhood Centers Day Care Association, the major prime sponsor contractor. The city's FY 1978 YETP allocation was $1.7 million of which about 28 percent or $468,867 is contracted to the local education agency for in-school youth programs.

The Neighborhood Centers Day Care Association (NCDCA) has been the major contractor for CETA youth programs over the past several years. NCDCA is a local public non-profit agency which provides centralized intake, assessment and referral services for all CETA programs. There are currently four satellite centers throughout the city which will operate during the summer months. In addition to the intake, assessment and referral activities, NCDCA also provides for most of the supportive services and is the contracting agency for most of the youth work sites and training.

During FY 1978, the CETA Title I program served approximately 750 in-school youths, provided training and support for adjudicated youth offenders through the Gulf Coast Trades Center at approximately $30,000 and funded a skills center through the Houston Community College at about $712,000 - $200,000 from CETA Title I. The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) provides services to an additional 1300 youth - 100 in YCCIP, 366 through the CETA/LEA program, and 816 in other YETP components.

The HISD has demonstrated creativity and foresight in its implementation of educational programs for youth. Over the past several years it has developed a complex of 49 magnet schools which enroll gifted and talented students and students with special needs from throughout the city. The magnet schools specialize in academic and vocational areas, e.g., High School for Performing and Visual Arts, Community As a School, High Schools of Engineering Professions, High School for Health Professions, and Ongoing Education School for Pregnant Girls. Also, HISD in 1974 opened its first alternative school for potential dropouts, Contemporary Learning Center. This school offers an individualized success-oriented learning opportunity for youth who are not successful in the traditional school mode. This is the framework in which the CETA/LEA relationship began.

Description of CETA/LEA Agreement

At the time of the site visit, the CETA/LEA program was operating under an interim non-financial agreement signed on January 26, 1978. The agreement provided for the development of an alternative education program for 200 potential or recent dropouts between the ages of 16 to 21 years, transitional services to 100 additional students and 20% of this number of slots for the 4 other school districts operating in the city. These transitional services included occupational information, career counseling and placement services. Academic credit was to be provided for work experience in the alternative education program and provisions were to be developed for credit to youth in the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP).

The agreement under negotiation with HISD is a financial one which specifically relates to the alternative education program. It details the goals, objectives and outcomes of the in-school program as well as describes the alternative school concept.

The alternative school funded through the CETA/LEA agreement is a jointly funded project with CETA, HISD and the Department of Human Resources (DHR). The major goal is to coordinate the delivery of social, educational and employment services needed to keep youth in school and ultimately prevent welfare dependency. Each of the 200 students will have a work/study or individualized instructional plan and a social services treatment plan.

The 2 major components of the program are an educational program and a work/training program. Each student will spend a half day in the competency-based, individualized, success oriented, vocational education program. Tailored training modules based on the vocational goal of each student will be used. New modules will be created and tested as they are developed and existing tested ones will be utilized to the extent possible. The instructional coordinator will be responsible for the development of modules.

The second half of the day will be spent in a vocational education program or a work experience based on the experience and interest of the individual. The Contemporary Occupational Training Center (COTC), which services youth other than those in the alternative school, will be used for vocational education. The skills training center offers training in food services, printing, general construction, general automobile mechanics, building maintenance, small engine repair, office duplicating machine repair and welding. Work experience sites will be developed for interested students by the occupational coordinator. Independent process and product evaluations are planned.

Process of Reaching Agreement

As stated earlier, there had been no previous agreements between CETA and HISD. However, HISD participated in CETA Title VI, Title I in-school and Title III summer programs as a subcontractor to one of the prime sponsor's contractors. In addition, the chairperson of the prime sponsor planning council was the HISD representative. Nevertheless, HISD was reluctuant to contract directly with CETA because of bad experiences under Model Cities where the school was left "holding the bag".

In September of 1977, the HISD and CETA began conversations pursuant to requirements in YEDPA. A non-financial agreement was negotiated at that time in order to begin the YETP programs and to permit time to negotiate a financial agreement. The non-financial agreement was not signed until January of 1978 because of city countil delays in approval. The city council delays were due to the election of a new mayor who, because of illness, was not able to convene the council.

In April, at the time of the site visit, the financial agreement was about ready to be signed. While there was agreement about the overall thrust of the CETA/LEA agreement, there were many details to be worked out. The concept of the alternative school had been developed as a $10 million proposal to the Department of Human Resources (DHR). Therefore, the financial arrangements had to be determined, coordination with DHR had to be finalized as well as minor details connected with restructuring to meet the requirements of YETP. In January, under the non-financial agreement, staff was hired to begin setting up the alternative school. At the time of the visit, approximately 40 students were enrolled. The program will be funded at approximately $1 million with CETA contributing almost $500,000 -- the remainder comes from HISD and DHR.

To date, the relationship appears to be working out well.

Program Observations

While there were apprehensions initially on the part of HISD about contracting with CETA, the schools saw this as an opportunity to serve more youth through interagency cooperation. Both agencies were serving essentially the same constituency. Both agencies had limited resources. The alternative school was a concept which had demonstrated merit. Therefore, both agencies plunged willingly into the relationship.

The Houston school district appeared to be quite progressive. At the highest levels, there was concern and interest in the program by CETA and HISD. The alternative school is a program which may become a model for other school systems throughout the country.

The area of academic credit is still a source of some contention. School officials do not encourage credit for work experience and appeared to be uncertain about exactly what the local and State laws required. It was clear that work experience is not normally substituted for formal training. While schools will not initiate the provision of credit for work, it appears that an individual may request credit from a school, take a competency based test and be awarded academic credit. School officials appeared to be interested in the area and may be willing to support it if prodded to do so.

The HISD was amenable also to working out some of the administrative concerns which normally cause problems, i.e., extended school day, vacation time, credit and graduation requirements. Because of the foresight and concern of school officials, the alternative school will operate on a quarter system, teachers will be paid for a longer day and students may graduate with a legitimate high school diploma.

This program is exemplary in its involvement of other agencies. The Neighborhood Center Day Care Association, a community based organization, is responsible for intake and initial client assessment and referral. The Department of Human Resources will develop the social services plan and provide appropriate supportive services. HISD will be responsible for overall administration, teachers and facilities and CETA will pay for most of the staff salaries and supplies. This pooling of resources makes possible the alternative school for 200 potential and recent dropouts.

Issues and Impacts

In Houston, YEDPA certainly contributed to the development of a relationship between the schools and CETA. In addition, had YETP funds not been available, the alternative school probably would not be operating at this time. The proposal had been submitted to the Department of Human Resources with little success and CETA had not been considered as a possible source of funding by the school district.

The school district is receptive to change. HISD is committed to the certification of all jobs as relevant to the students' career plans. They are willing to consider development of procedures which will make it possible to award credit for work experiences. A major concern of HISD is that the 22% set aside be eliminated because they feel they can secure more funds without it. Because of it, the CETA prime sponsor thinks in terms of 22 percent. According to school officials more and better programs can be developed with more money.

Another concern raised by the schools was a need for more "brick and mortar" money. The alternative school is housed in part of an elementary school. They feel such a facility should be in a separate location because of potential problems between the teenagers and elementary students. There may, however, also be some advantages such as the possibility of youth tutoring youth programs or other programs serving youth, e.g., recreational programs for the elementary school students.

The prime sponsor was concerned about placement activities on the part of the schools. There are placement specialists in each high school (approximately 30) but most are heavily involved in work site selection, leaving little time for job development and placement of graduates. The prime sponsor feels that more emphasis should be placed on the placement of graduates into permanent jobs.

The schools and CETA expressed an interest in greater involvement of community based organizations (CBO) in training -- either through arrangements with the public schools or proprietary schools. The hope is to expand the number of providers of training activities. Some resistance is expected from the public schools. It was refreshing, nevertheless, to see the interest in greater involvement of community-based organizations.

Neither the schools nor CETA expressed much interest in on-site technical assistance from DOL or HEW. They felt they had the technical competence in program design and administration. Their interest was basically in the sharing of program information nationally regarding what was occurring in other locations.

Houston demonstrates one possibility of what can be accomplished when the education and the employment/training communities work together. There was general concern, enthusiasm and competence exhibited by staff of both agencies. The relationship is one which has potential for growth.

## 2. Putting It All Together:

## Worcester In-School Programs

### The Setting

Worcester is a relatively small city in Massachusetts with a population of approximately 500,000. The CETA prime sponsor is part of a Worcester manpower consortium, which includes 13 other towns in addition to Worcester city proper. The Worcester manpower consortium is part of the City Manager's Office of Planning. Total YEDPA funding available to the prime sponsor is approximately $650,000.

There is a Director, Assistant Director and four other full-time professionals running the operation.

Worcester received a YETP and a YCCIP grant totaling $409,938 and $238,899 respectively. The students served ranged from the potential drop-out to ex-offenders. The target group is basically in-school (YETP) and out-of-school youth experiencing difficulties with the law (YCCIP). There are four high schools in Worcester served by the YETP program. An additional four high schools located in the nearby towns (part of the consortium) are being served as well. The YETP program serves the in-school youth by placing them into public sector jobs, providing counseling, skills training, and academic credit for work experience.

The Worcester Community Action Council acts as the community based vehicle to operate the YETP program. The CBO supervises the counseling and instructional staff in preparing the youth for work and study.

### Nature of the CETA/Worcester Schools YETP

One hundred percent of the YETP funds have been allocated to serve in-school youth in programs designed to enhance the career opportunities and job prospects pursuant to the agreements between CETA/and LEAs. Every enrollee in the program will require employment and training services to act as a catalyst for continuing their education. All employees (enrollees) participate in career employment experience. The Worcester Prime Sponsor designated two community based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness as service deliverers for YEDPA:

1. The Worcester Community Action Council (Project Transition). Project Transition was allocated $409,938 of YETP funds to provide career employment experience opportunities for 240 youth in the target community.

2. Youth Opportunities Upheld, Inc. (Work TEC Project). Work TEC was allocated $238,899 of YCCIP funds to serve 119 youth with ex-offender status.

The LEA agreement, was signed by the Worcester prime sponsor and representatives of 13 consortium towns and cities, covering both component parts of the local YETP program and providing such services as initial recruitment and selection to the awarding of academic credit.

YCCIP

The Worcester prime sponsor allocated funds to implement the Parks and Recreation/Worcester Public Schools Educational Conservation project. The project was designed to serve 50 youth from the consortium area who are out-of-school and experiencing extreme difficulty obtaining employment. The participants are economically disadvantaged; the average reading competency is below the sixth grade; half of the enrollees are offenders; half are welfare recipients; 40 percent are minorities; all have expressed total dissatisfaction with the academic world; all have demonstrated unsatisfactory work habits and records; and a large proportion of the females are unemployed heads of households and unwed mothers. Every enrollee in the YCCIP program engages in an academic component whereby he or she receives academic credit and a Grade Equivalency Diploma (GED) through the Worcester public schools adult learning center. Although a formal LEA agreement was not mandated by YCCIP regulations, the Worcester prime sponsor in an effort to facilitate the awarding of academic credit for all participants entered into such agreement. The structure of the agreement was as follows:

1. Background statement;
2. An assessement of existing youth services;
3. Program purpose;
4. Results and benefits expected out of the program which includes goals, objectives, and evaluative statement;
5. Administrative procedures detailing the schools and CBOs responsibilities for supervising and administering the program; and,
6. Additional provisions.

Process of Developing the CETA/Worcester Schools Agreement

The LEA agreement was finalized after extensive meetings between prime sponsor and school personnel. Although they only had 10 days to firm up the agreement, they had been meeting in preparation for the programs months ahead of time. A primary factor that expedited the agreement was that the principles had known each other in other circles and had built a relationship that was cordial and understanding. Even more helpful was the fact that the YETP and YCCIP programs were very similar to proposed programs supported by some key actors in Worcester. The YETP program was conceptually promoted by the education and work council which had come into existence two years before YEDPA. The YCCIP program was conceptualized by a school counselor and parks and recreation supervisor a year before YEDPA legislation. Now with the influx of dollars, these ideas came into fruition and the conceptual and manpower requirements to begin the effort were well underway.

The CETA manpower agency was familiar with the individuals mentioned above and were brought in early when the YEDPA program was announced. Adjustments were made to fulfill the objectives and requirements of YETP and YCCIP, but the conceptual design previously developed remained intact.

Program Observations:

A big factor was the quality of personnel. The CETA director had savvy and was a longtime advocate of employment and training programs for the Worcester community. He exemplified the New England manner of doing things, methodical and sensitive to local community desires and needs. The Assistant Director in charge of youth programs was meticulous and made very sure that every statement was fully understood and clarified. The rest of the staff represented different walks of life within the Worcester community. The program officer was a minority person with extensive experience in CETA programs throughout New England. The budget officer was a young aggressive product of Worcester who had work experience with correctional programs.

The school personnel were equally high quality. Both the District's Career Guidance Counselor and Director of Counseling and Guidance had a great deal of experience with work experience programs. The Career Guidance counselor ran the non-pay cooperative education program for the district. He was able to guide the development of the YEDPA program to fit into the school structure and processes. The district director for counseling and guidance represented the concerns and fears of the superintendent in establishing a program that would award academic credit for work experience, but he was amenable to compromise.

The largest problem in the school's eyes was scheduling. How were they going to schedule kids for classes and work, given the number of hours required by the district and the State for attendance? They recognized that seniors would be the easiest group to work with in terms of scheduling, but juniors and freshman who were marginal could use the assistance even more. Early intervention was advisable. They were able to work through this problem by calling two long and arduous meetings coordinated by the prime sponsor in consultation with school personnel, education and work council members, and community based personnel involved in youth/school programs. The picture looked quite rosy on the first day with some apprehension about when all this co-operation would come to a halt; when the real story would be told. This really never happened. With the exception of some minor disagreements with the education and work council over how far reaching these programs could be, cooperation among the key actors was astoundingly good.

The counselors involved in the YETP program were young and idealistic. They were supervising the YETP participants at the worksite and worked with the school counselors at the school site. The counseling ratio was 2 for 25 students. This is almost an ideal counselor/student ratio that is not typical of most school districts. The counselors from the CBO (Project Transition) had devised a careful plan to keep track of their students. If a student did not show up for school they did not get paid for the number of hours missed. This was agreed upon by the student and the counselor through a learning contract that was signed before the student was accepted into the program. The contract was enforced.

The director of Project Transition reported to the executive director of the Worcester Community Action Council. The two had a very good relationship. The executive director was an old-time poverty program fighter, who had worked with community projects for many years in Worcester. The director of Transition was a young protege of the executive director who believed in the effective role of community action programs in meeting the needs of the poor. The relationship between the Executive Director of the Community Action Council and the Director of CETA was cordial. But the undertone of the relationship was one of tolerance. In other words the classical rift between the community agency breaking new ground versus the perceived rigidity of the funding agency (CETA) existed. But it was a working relationship. A central theme with the community action agency was how can we link up with other CETA programs to support the YEDPA effort. This was encouraging. They were seeking guidance from CETA officials on this.

The YCCIP school coordinator and the parks and recreation supervisor were delighted with YCCIP and YETP because they had long proposed similar concepts. The school representative certified the youngsters in the program with the school and verified the attendance of the YCCIP participants in the adult learning center. The teacher in the learning center was honest in his approach with the students by telling them that the central purpose of the YCCIP program was earning a wage. The participants worked at three parks supervised by foremen of park employees. Thirty hours a week on the jobs with a two week orientation and 10 hours per month instruction was the core of the program. Class instruction was basically remedial with coping skills taught, such as reading to pass driving tests, obtaining social security cards, and opening up a bank account. The park supervisor (parks and recreation director) was supportive of the program and discussed how well the students got along with other park employees. Youth involved in parks projects demonstrated a great deal of enthusiasm. The youth were expected to learn recreation scheduling, grounds maintenance, and safety.

Project YES is the YETP component directed to ex-offenders. The project provides counseling and instruction in consultation with the schools. A school counselor certifies and verifies attendance and acts as the conduit to grant credit. GED's are given at the end of the year. The instruction is in basic skills and relevant materials are used to motivate the students to read and write. The average reading level of the participants is 5th grade. Transportation is provided by way of reimbursement for bus or cab fare. Some of the students are still wards of correctional institutions. The institution allows the student to leave the premises to work and attend the school project. For instance, a young male who had a history of encounters with the law worked in a nearby State institution for the mentally disturbed as a groundskeeper. He was learning from an old hand (15 years) the horticulture trade and attended classes at Project YES. A counselor, job developer, and a teacher were all involved in formulating his plan. The youth was congenial, shy, and somewhat taken aback with all the attention he was getting. The plan appeared very comprehensive and costly.

Issues and Impact

There is much to be said about smallness. The CETA people knew many of the key actors in the schools, CBO's, correctional institutions, and the Economic Development Agency. This was a central feature in the LEA/CETA relationship; namely prior working relationships that laid the foundation for YEDPA. A second feature was that there were community organizations that had experience with the target groups with which YEDPA was concerned. These agencies had a series of projects and experiences that served as a foundation for the YETP and YCCIP programs.

A third ingredient was the ability of the schools to build upon their cooperative work experience and work study programs to serve as a model for the agreement reached between CETA and the LEA. Interested personnel from the schools saw this as a golden opportunity to bring into fruition many of the untested ideas and concepts discussed through the years.

Fourth, available funding was the key, but there is no mechanism to begin to institutionalize the programs. This is a flaw with YEDPA. There needs to be a strategy on how local communities could use the start up funds to develop new programs and then institutionalize them.

Fifth, CETA was tied into all the major aspects of the social, political, and economic life of Worcester. This is a key to developing working relationships with CBOs and schools. They understood the constraints schools faced and were willing to work with them.

Sixth, the vocational schools were not involved with YEDPA. This is due to the structured way in which they run. In Massachusetts, vocational schools are exclusive training centers, where graduates are guaranteed jobs. Consequently, the admission into these schools is highly competitive and low income students are at a disadvantage in qualifying for entrance.

The impact of YEDPA is essentially that the youth now play a central role in the city's development through training and employment opportunities fostered by CETA and YEDPA. Youth are being focused upon in a serious way. Schools are delighted to receive the help from CETA in locating jobs and promoting the need to finish a high school education and post secondary school entrance. But the issue for Worcester will be, can they foster such programs without Federal help? Worcester must develop some institutionalization strategies that will take resources from the schools, CETA, YEDPA, CBO's and other agencies interested in curtailing youth unemployment and delinquency.

## 3. Achieving Collaboration in Minnesota BOS

### Institutional Structure

The Minnesota governmental system has a rather unique organizational structure which has significantly shaped LEA-CETA relations in the balance-of-state. In 1969, the Minnesota legislature enacted the Regional Development Act, establishing 13 sub-State regions for planning and coordination of programs in criminal justice, land use, transportation, economic development, employment and training, health, and housing. Each Region has a Regional Development Commission (RDC) consisting of county and municipal officials. The Balance-of-State comprises eight of these 13 regions.

Each RDC has a complement of paid staff, including a Manpower Planner, one of whose principal functions is to serve as the staff arm to the Regional Manpower Advisory Committees (RMAC) which correspond in composition and function to CETA advisory groups at other levels.

In Minnesota, there are 437 school districts. Over 200 of those 437 are located within the 54 counties which constitute the Balance-of-State. In addition, there are two kinds of educational cooperatives in Minnesota; both are regarded as local education agencies. The first type, called Educational Cooperative Service Units (ECSU) are mandatory planning cooperatives established by State statute. There are nine in the state. The second type, called Regional Interdistrict Councils (RIC's), are voluntary cooperatives and are focused on special education; there are approximately 60 in the State.

The BOS has 14 field offices called CETA Centers (CETC's) scattered throughout the eight regions covered by the BOS.

In FY 1978, the BOS operated five programs other than YETP specifically targeted at youth. These were the:

Title I In-School Program--Aimed at providing employment opportunities for youth who are enrolled in school or who are planning to return to school during the next regular school term. The program serves 3,163 youth at a cost of $758,818. It was estimated that approximately half of Title I funds served youth in FY 1977.

Summer Program for Economically Disadvantaged Youth (SPEDY)--Aimed at 14-21 year old youth. The program serves 2,453 youth at a cost of $2,561,644.

Governor's Youth Program--Similar to SPEDY serving 1,450 economically disadvantaged youth at a cost of approximately $1 million.

Summer Youth Recreation Program--Providing recreational opportunities for young people aged 8-13 who are from economically disadvantaged households. The program serves 2,040 youth at a cost of $46,077.

Youth Community Conservation Improvement Program (YCCIP)--Serving 81 youth at a cost of $318,146.

Youth Employment and Training Programs--This program serves an additional 1,728 youth at a cost of $1,798,911. Of this amount, approximately $1 million goes to in-school programs.

There is a history of strong commitment to and financial support for public education throughout the State. The State Department of Education is active and traditionally plays a strong part in technical assistance and guidance. Career education has been given high visibility within the state during the past eight years. Approximately three-fourths of the secondary schools in Minnesota are covered by vocational cooperative centers. These centers were started in the mid 1960's under the auspices of the RIC's to give schools access to vocational training facilities they could not support on an individual school basis. Youth attend such centers two hours a day.

Minnesota has an excellent system of 33 post secondary Area Vocational Technical Institutes which offer Adult Basic Education and GED preparation in addition to a large number of skill training programs.

Minnesota is also one of eight states funded by the Department of Labor to establish and operate a state-wide computerized career information system. Although Minnesota Occupational Information System is only 3 years old, it seems to be widely used throughout the state by educational institutions and increasingly by CETA.

Community Action Agencies have traditionally been involved in the operation of youth programs under Title I. In most of the sub-state regions, an agreement has been reached to turn in-school programs over to Community Action Agencies and out of school programs to the CETC's.

In summary, Minnesota has a unique administrative structure for decentralized governance and an impressive combination of strong education, manpower and governmental institutions willing and able to work together.

Process of Reaching Agreement

News of YEDPA implementation policy was eagerly sought by the education establishment. The Minnesota Department of Education, in particular, took the initiative to prepare itself for a strong role in facilitating the implementation of the Act. Community action agencies also were ready to play a major role. Each group geared up to insure their "piece of the action."

By the fall of 1977, it was clear that competition was developing between the CAA's and CETC's and that RMAC's, RDC's and the State Department of Education were all interested in becoming involved. BOS decided to leave decisions on who would become program operators, what the in and out of school mix would be and other design questions to the sub-state regional level. The only parameters set by BOS were that only the poor would be served and that 35% of the YETP money would be reserved for out-of-school programs with CETC's, the exclusive operators of such out-of-school programs. Since by law at least 22% of the funds had to be allocated to in-school programs, that left 43% of the funds to be distributed between in-and out-of-school programs at the discretion of the RMAC.

BOS required that each RMAC choose one lead agency for the in-school program and that the agency would then contract with those LEA's whose proposals were approved and accepted by the RMAC. The contractual relationships that resulted were triangular with the selected CAA or CETC subcontracting with the LEA and the BOS executing non-financial CETA-LEA agreements with each of the participating LEA's. The administrative arrangements for all of the sub-state regions included in the BOS are as follows:

| Region | Geographic Area | Out-of-School YETP Operator | In-School YETP Program Agent | Number of Participating LEA's |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | NW Minnesota (7 counties) | CETA Centers (Crookston and Thief River Falls) | CAA: Inter-County Community Council | 2 RIC's Comprise 22 LEA's |
| 6W | Upper Minn. River Valley (5 counties) | Montevideo CETC | Prairie Five CAA | 20 |
| 6E | Kandiyohi, Meeker, McLeod and Renville Counties | Willmar CETC | Willmar CETC | 15 |
| 7W | Central Minn. (4 counties) | St. Cloud CETC | Tri-County CAA | 5 |
| 7E | E. Central Minn. (5 counties) | Mora CETC | Lakes & Pines CAA | 4 |
| 8 | Southwest Mn. (9 counties) | Marshall CETC & Worthington CETC | Marshall CETC & Worthington CETC | 42 |
| 9 | South Central Mn. (9 counties) | New Ulm CETC Mankato CETC Fairmont CETC | Minnesota Valley CAC | 19 |
| 10 | Southwestern Mn. (11 counties) | Owatonna CETC Rochester CETC Winona CETC | Two CAA's: - SEMCAC - GRW | 3 |

All CETA-LEA agreements and sub-grants were signed by February.

Youth Employment Education Unit

The first FY 1978 grant made by the office of Statewide CETA Coordination, Department of Economic Security using its 5% money was to establish a Youth Employment Unit within the State Department of Education for the purpose of serving as a catalyst to improve CETA-LEA relationships and to provide technical assistance and support as appropriate. Since the Unit was established in August 1977, it was able to help in facilitating CETA-LEA agreements by sponsoring a series of workshops for LEA's (one in November and 11 in April) and making joint visits with BOS staff during the negotiation and start-up period. In addition, CETA-BOS consulted with the Unit staff in developing the model agreement used throughout the BOS. The Unit has also worked with various teacher associations to try to overcome the reluctance of teachers to accept new roles under experimental learning programs such as YETP.

The Youth Employment Education Unit is funded at $106,000 and when fully staffed will have a director, three professional staff including two curriculum specialists -- one for career development and one for basic skills, and a program specialist who will concentrate on issues related to academic credit, staff credentials, financing and other issues of concern to local school districts. Staff for the Unit was instrumental in developing a policy on how work experience programs effect state aid financing.

The Governor's Office of Manpower, BOS and State Education staffs all indicated tremendous enthusiasm and support for this Unit. Local school administrators and others interviewed felt that the Unit served a useful function in information sharing and institutional brokering to get CETA-LEA cooperation off the ground. An important challenge for the Unit will be to develop a strong technical assistance capability that will be non-threatening to either side and supportive of their mutual interests.

Program Improvement

The CETA Director's assessment of the impact of YEDPA on the quality of the in-school program being operated is that the legislation and regulations forced the development of a more comprehensive youth program than had existed before. However, he believes such programs would have developed anyway over time since substantial CETA resources have gone to schools over the past years.

Although CETA staff was not happy with what they considered lack of flexibility in the program, they were pleased with the general improvement in youth programming since the implementation of YEDPA. For instance, the quality of work sites has improved under YETP with work sites being developed outside the school setting. Because of the maintenance of effort provisions under YETP, program operators have tended to upgrade their Title I program along with YETP implementation. It was expected that this cross-over effect would improve the quality of worksites under the SPEDY program.

Several people commented on the benefit of the Career Employment Experience which includes counseling and supportive services along with work experience programs. Under YETP, schools have been able to use various sources of funds creatively to develop more responsive comprehensive programs.

Academic Credit-Staff Licensing

State policy on academic credit is that it may be given for experimental programs if the credit is needed by the student. Credit may be given in programs where the coordinator or teacher has a vocational education license. If less than one hour per day is spent in the community, no such special license is required. Usually, credits are given in elective areas, but for one YCCIP program referred to previously, the state gives both elective and required science credit for participation in the program.

No major change in policy, such as giving credit for experiential programs across the board will likely be considered until school administrators get a better feel for the scope and longevity of programs such as YETP.

One Alternative School program in the state provides a good example of how the awarding of credit has strengthened the program and helped sell the concept of alternative education to the local school board parents and other students. The standards for obtaining credit are so stringent that no one considers the program a free ride. Students in this program spend four periods per day in the classroom and work 15 hours per week within the community. Credit for the classroom component is given on the basis of productive time spent within the classroom at a rate of one credit for each 120 clock hours. Students can get up to two credits per school year for the work experience component. The summer program does not grant any school credits.

Private Sector

The limitations of public sector work sites in rural areas were evident in visits to both northern and southern Minnesota sites. In Region I, public sector job sites are limited to schools and a few social service agencies. The original Region I YETP plan proposed to subsidize private sector work experience in conjunction with the Work Experience/Comprehensive Employment Program which is operated by the schools. Since such a program was not approved on legal grounds, the in-school portion of YETP was cut from 85% to 45% of YETP funds.

Staff believed that public sector sites did not provide the necessary occupational range for career explorations. Work experience opportunities developed in Region 10 include a secretarial job in a military recruiting office, custodial work in a national guard armory, and work in a coffee house run by a community agency. Since both Regions visited are heavily engaged in agriculture, there was an interest to do more in agricultural fields but no opportunities exist in the public sector.

Career Information

Both Region I and Region X have invested substantial resources in career guidance and information services because they feel it is important to help young people in rural areas to obtain knowledge about opportunities for education and employment outside their immediate geographic area.

In Region I, 5% of the YETP funds went to the University of Minnesota to operate a Career Awareness Laboratory. The laboratory will act as a resource center for the entire area to train counselors and teachers, provide staff orientation as well as provide direct counseling and information services to youth and others needing career guidance. The intention is to establish a network of counselors in schools throughout the area being served who will be able to use the center on their own, refer youth and provide career guidance services in schools. It is hoped that the Employment Service will provide placement services. The laboratory will be tied into the state-wide MOIS program and will use a variety of commercial systems. Two impressive career guidance centers exist in Region X, one associated with the Area Vocational Technical Institute in Red Wing. YETP youth are benefitting from these centers as part of their program.

Financing

With generally declining enrollments, school districts were worried about the impact of YETP and other community-based experiential learning programs on their state financial support (ASAD).

The State Department of Education policy developed is that up to three hours per day of the six required for state funding can be done outside the classroom -- the policy also recognizes time spent in programs which are jointly funded with education such as YETP.

The Alternative School program will be financed through regular educational funding within the next two years. In this year, YETP funds are being used to pay the percentage of operating costs over and above the state aid received because of increased attendance. It is anticipated that in FY 1979, YETP will pay only for the lapse time while classroom attendance builds up to full enrollment or the break-even point for each class/teacher situation.

It would appear that the desire to maximize average daily attendance in order to get more state aid would be a major incentive to interest schools in participating in a program that encourages dropouts to return and potential dropouts to stay in school. The issue is much more complex in that school funding formulas require local dollars to match state funds. In some cases communities do not have the resources to pay for expanded education programs. Furthermore, small, relatively poor school districts are reluctant to institute new programs with federal or other funds unless they feel confident that the additional services can be maintained over a period of time without creating an undue burden on their tax dollars. They do not want to build up expectations and get people used to services which cannot be absorbed into local budgets. Because of YEDPA's original one-year authorization, the long-term funding issue remains and is of concern especially to smaller, conservative towns. One RIC passed a resolution that no program would continue past federal funding.

The other side of the coin is that YETP money has been used to finance needed programs and serve youth such as dropouts who could not be served under existing education resources. The program developed is limited by the insufficient staff that can be supported by program dollars. At the time of the

visit, three Title VI funded counselors worked on the Title I and SPEDY programs. They could not reasonably be expected to perform all of the required functions under YETP as well. No other in-school staff was available. An application for an Exemplary In-School grant was submitted in an attempt to get funding for year-round staff to work with youth.

Lastly, an important issue to school administrators, particularly in northern Minnesota, is that it is difficult to justify building up a new, and to some extent "nonessential" program while basic services and staff are being cut back. In Region I, it was therefore convenient to add staff and resources at the RIC rather than the local school district level.

Community Attitudes

BOS Minnesota encompasses, for the most part, small towns where everybody knows everybody else. "Problem youth" and "problem families" are known to the community, so a program geared to work with these populations can easily become negatively labelled.

The Austin Alternative School program is actually a small program option with the school. The concept of a separate program for such youth with special needs met with substantial opposition by the school board and teachers. Teachers felt threatened and the school board was worried about drawing youngsters out of the regular school program as well as reluctant to face financing such a program in the future. Nevertheless, the Board was faced with a relatively high school dropout rate compared with the rest of the state, and declining enrollments.

The Vocational Education Director for the Austin Public Schools can be credited with bringing about changed attitudes in Austin by working with the school board and staff to assuage their fears. At first, the school board established an Alternative School Committee to study the proposal. The Board finally decided to go with a program to serve 15 youngsters who had been out of school at least 90 days.

Those teachers who had voiced greatest opposition to the program were included in the committee to select youth for the program. Three full-time staff people work with the 15 youth in the program. The program was small enough not to be highly visible, yet word got out among staff and students that the program was not easy. Parents and teachers have been happy with changes in the behavior and attitudes of the students.

Next year, the program will be included in the School Board program, receiving greatly reduced support by CETA. In addition, the 90-day dropout period will be shortened and an evening option included.

In Region I, staff indicated a problem of developing work sites for youth who have a bad reputation in their communities. Lack of transportation and long distances between communities contribute to the problem.

Institutional Change

The governmental structure and the long experience of various sectors of the community working together provided a fertile environment for collaboration in responding to the challenges of YEDPA. One person interviewed in Region I suggested there was no problem in working together because there was mutual trust in the quality and reliability of programs being operated and a shared faith in the competence of the public officials in their communities.

In Region X, the same cooperative spirit was evident. Unlike in the north, where schools and community service agencies have, over the years, been forced to work together because of scarcity of resources, geographic and other considerations of scale, the southeast has had more opportunity to develop separate education and employment and training systems. One individual who has worked in the vocational education system for years had never worked with individuals he has met as a result of YETP. He made the point that now that he has gotten to know kindred souls working in related but, up to now, separate areas. He will continue to work with them whether YETP continues or not. He summed it up by saying "Institutions don't collaborate, people do."

The CETA Director was confident that significant change would be taking place within schools and in the relationship between CETA and schools because of the fair and open process of communication and working together that was started as part of YEDPA implementation. He gives credit to the State Education agency Youth Employment Education Unit for playing an important facilitative role.

## 4. Negligible Impacts: The Fairfax County, Virginia, YETP Program

### Background

The economic situation in Fairfax County is good. The unemployed rate is approximately 3.5%. Housing construction is expanding. Major corporate headquarters are increasingly being established in the County. High level jobs are available to those with skills. The County population is predominately white. There is a growing black population and a significant number of Vietnamese. Most of the working population in the County is employed in the District of Columbia and the public transportation system is designed for commuting to and from the District. Travel within the County via public transport is difficult.

The Title I CETA program has sponsored a large English language program for the foreignborn which is operated by the Arlington School District at their Northern Virginia Training Center. In addition, CETA contracts with the Fairfax County School System are to operate a skill training program, primarily for those over 18 years old, at Fort Belvoir. The Army provides the facilities. Remedial education is provided as needed in this program.

Since NYC days, the Fairfax County Schools have operated an in-school work experience program and a summer youth program. Both programs provide jobs within the school system, mostly in maintenance, food and clerical services. The program has not changed much since it was started in 1965. The program is aimed at low income youth who need money to stay in school. Since the number of CETA youth within any junior or senior high school is low, numbers of youth in work sites is low and supervision and personal attention is good. The prime sponsor's assessment of the program is that it perpetuates race and sex bias in work-site placements and that not enough job skills are developed, but that the program is honestly run and the participants have real jobs and good work experience.

The Fairfax County School System operates comprehensive high schools in which both academic and vocational curricula are available. Each school has at least several vocational programs such as automotive repair and cosmetology; four schools have special programs which are available to youth from other schools.

Each high school has several cooperative programs which combine classroom work and work experience. Students on these programs get credit for their work experience. A rather unique program is offered at a construction site where youth are given academic courses by certified teachers at the work site. An evening apprenticeship program in the building trades is available to adults. This program is sometimes used as an alternative to daytime programs for in-school youth who are under 18 years of age.

A Career Education law was passed in the state legislature requiring each student to have a skill when he or she graduates. There is also a requirement that placement services must be available within each high school. Since about 70% of high school students in Fairfax County go on to college, job placement and development of vocational skills have not been given high priority. The Career Education emphasis does seem to be making an impact on academic curricula, counseling and guidance programs. There appears to be a genuine interest in infusing the educational program for all youth with career awareness.

The CETA director and school officials both indicated that, it was difficult to relate the CETA or YETP in-school program to the school operated vocational, cooperative and career education programs because of the conservative nature of the school system, particularly, the teachers involved in these programs. The CETA program is used to supplement the school offered programs by offering work experience opportunities to those who do not qualify for cooperative programs because they do not meet the prerequisites for these programs. CETA serves predominantly 14-16 year olds who are too young for co-op programs, special education students and slow learners.

Nature of the Prime Sponsor-LEA Agreement

The agreement, signed March 20, 1978, is between Fairfax County and the two school systems within it, represented by the Fairfax County School Board and the City of Falls Church School Board. The agreement specified that the LEA's will provide 56 students (53 in the Fairfax County Schools and three in the City of Falls Church Schools) with work experience at sites within the school systems. The agreement is for the period January 1, 1978 to September 30, 1978 at a level of funding of $61,484; this amount is 25% of the total CETA youth budget of $245,000.

Administration of the program is by the Fairfax County Schools and $11,346 of YETP funds are allocated for the salaries of a program director and one assistant. The budget also specified $5,614 to hire a part-time person to coordinate placement activities. Wages to youth participants account for the remaining $44,524 of the budget.

Services specified in the agreement in addition to work experience include career guidance to assist youth in making more informed occupational decisions, career and job information, work orientation, and supervision at the work sites. Academic credit is to be provided where work experience is applicable to the student's school curriculum. Skill training is specified as an important component of the program and where possible 60% of the youth are to be provided skill training: in the construction trades (15%), automotive repair (10%), data processing (20%), warehouse management (5%), and food service (10%). However, the agreement clarified that the primary objective of the program is "to reinforce positive work habits and job readiness skills to make the transition from school to work a smoother process."

Reaching the CETA-LEA Agreement

The process for reaching the agreement was very straightforward and based almost entirely on the relationships that existed prior to YEDPA. The prime sponsor called Fairfax County Schools and Falls Church Schools to a meeting to discuss the YETP provisions. Falls Church has a separate school system having previously separated from the Fairfax system. Although Falls Church had its own program ideas, by population it would be entitled to only 1 or 2 slots. It was decided that only one CETA-LEA agreement would be signed and that one with Fairfax County. Falls Church would get a minimum of three slots from Fairfax County.

Since the prime sponsor is primarily interested in skill training and programs leading to direct placement in unsubsidized employment and since youth unemployment is not considered a crisis in Fairfax, there was little enthusiasm for expanding the in-school program as operated by the Fairfax County Schools. The prime sponsor, therefore, decided that only 25% of the YETP funds would go to the in-school program.

The prime sponsor requested that the Fairfax School develop a program above and beyond the Title I program which would (1) upgrade opportunities to develop acquisition of lifetime skills; and (2) improved placement services. There was no argument on either

side but due to a misunderstanding, neither side wrote up the agreement until the last moment. The prime inserted targets for each of the five new occupational areas developed under the YETP program to encourage the school system to generate worksites.

The general lack of concern for the in-school program is illustrated by the fact that the CETA director was not aware of modifications made to the agreement after the signing. He is also not concerned with the slow rate of implementation because he feels he could better use the money if the school system does not reach the slot levels under the agreement. The CETA director would have liked the school system to come up with something more innovative but felt that there was not enough time and the amount of money was too small to interest the schools. The CETA director felt that he had very little leverage to change the school's program particularly because of the political tension that exists between the County government of which he is a part and the elected school board.

Observations

At the time of the visit, approximately 30 youths were assigned to work sites within the school system. This was considered good progress by the LEA, given the short amount of time available to plan and implement the agreement. Because it was decided at a later time to set up a summer program under the agreement, the number of participants during the academic year was reduced to approximately 40, the remaining slots to go to summer participants.

No counseling, career information, or career planning activities were in operation although it was reported that career development materials were being bought for CETA youth. The coordinator for placement activities had not been hired, but an individual had been identified for the position. It was learned that this person would be responsible for identifying work sites for the in-school program rather than placing program leavers in unsubsidized jobs. It was reported that no participants were receiving academic credit for work experience.

Identifying work sites was considered a challenging task by both the CETA and LEA staff. The CETA Director considered the upgrading of the quality of work experiences to be the most important contribution the YETP program could make to CETA youth programs. The LEA was attempting to open

up new opportunities for work experience within the school system, but saw this being done through a slow and steady effort. Students are reportedly placed in work sites only where supervision is based on a personal commitment by the site supervisor, and the process of gaining the cooperation of potential work-site supervisors is slow-moving.

The public transportation system in Fairfax County was cited by all as a severe constraint on creating new work experiences since a youth has to have a car to travel to many work sites. The school system does not seem able to finance travel to and from sites in the absence of public transportation.

Issues and Impacts

In the main, the immediate impact of the YETP funds is to increase the number of students who are receiving subsidized work experience. It is not known whether the work skills and attitudes of the participants are being affected, but it is clear that YETP youth are receiving no special treatment beyond the work experience itself. It is also clear that these YETP youth would not be getting the benefits they do receive in the absence of the 22% set aside for in-school programs.

The YETP funds have not had any noticeable impact on the school system itself, such as in raising the question of special career planning classes for CETA youth or raising for further consideration the criteria for awarding credit for work experience. These questions will probably not arise as long as the more urgent task is to find job sites and youth to be placed in them. Program leadership says they would like to innovate, but in their eyes there is no time or money to do so.

## 5. Business As Usual:

## Los Angeles CETA/School Programs

### Background

Four CETA programs serve in-school youth in the city of Los Angeles. Title I provides $5.0 million for some 1200-1300 youth slots in eight skills centers that receive both CETA and Vocational Education Act (VEA) funds. Approximately $2.8 million of this amount goes to students; the rest supports skill training for out-of-school youth. Title I funds also support employment and training services for in-school youth that are provided by other community-based organizations (CBO's). The remaining three programs are under Title III: The summer youth program (SPEDY) which provided 14,500 jobs for youth in 1977 at a cost of $11.7 million, and two programs under the new YEDPA legislation, namely, the Youth Employment and Training Program (YETP) which provided 1800 slots in FY 1978 at a cost of $6.9 million, including $1.5 million which was spent under an agreement with the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) -- 22 percent of the total --, and the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects Program (YCCIP) which provided 200 slots in FY 1978 at a cost of $1.1 million.

Approximately 20 percent of all Title I funds are targeted on youth and are administered by the CETA Youth Services Office. With the exception of YCCIP, students constitute a substantial proportion of the youth served by these programs. LAUSD has three separate contracts or financial agreements with the Youth Services office - Title I, SPEDY, and YETP. Inasmuch as some students in Los Angeles attend school in another prime sponsor's jurisdiction, i.e., Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles City prime sponsor also has a contract with the LA County school system to provide services to 75 of its students. LAUSD also has a contract with the State Board of Vocational Education, which administers a 5 percent setaside from Title I of CETA.

LAUSD is a large urban school district with approximately 138,000 high school students and some 34-36,000 graduates per year since 1973. As high school enrollments have declined during the last 5 years, the proportion of dropouts has declined also. In 1976, the attrition or dropout rate was 22.9 percent compared to 25.0 percent in 1972.

Almost 8 percent of Los Angeles high school students participate in a school-arranged work experience program. Of the 11,041 who participated in these programs in 1977, 9,488 were involved in cooperative education with private employers, 955 were working for LAUSD and paid out of CETA funds, and 598 were attending continuation school work components. Many other students work during the year, including some who get paid with CETA funds administered through some CBO's.

The school-arranged programs are run by work experience coordinators who are found in every high school. Some work experience coordinators supervise the regular co-op program in the private sector, while others supervise the CETA students working for LAUSD. CETA students working in CBO's are occasionally counseled by the work experience coordinators. Their efforts are supplemented by some 30 work experience advisors who attempt to locate and develop worksites for students, as well as assure that the work experience obtained has educational value. Fourteen of these work experience advisors are assigned to the CETA program, while 16 are assigned to the regular cooperative (private sector) program.

Work experience credit toward graduation is granted only when the work experience is arranged and supervised by school representatives and is satisfactorily performed by the students. Students must be regularly enrolled during the session for which credit is granted, and they must attend related (career oriented) instruction in order to obtain credit. Fifteen hours of related instruction are scheduled during each semester. Vocational work experience enrollees who take training in the same (or a similar) field as their work experience are exempt from the special related instruction class. All YETP clients must take the related instruction class, which includes some career orientation and personal assessment.

Nature of the CETA/LAUSD Agreement and Program Under YETP

The contract between the City of Los Angeles and LAUSD for YETP funds serves as the LEA agreement required by YEDPA. In FY 1978 LAUSD received $1.5 million, an amount equal to 22 percent of the total YETP funds allocated to the city. These funds allow LAUSD to provide career employment experience and auxillary transition services, including occupational testing, training, and career guidance and information. All of the auxillary services must serve students participating in the work experience program.

Officially, the schools and the CETA youth office only had 3 days to do the planning for the CETA/LEA agreement under YETP. The LAUSD work experience office was notified by the superintendent that the district would get 22 percent of the YETP funds going to Los Angeles, and a proposal had to be developed right away. Though the work experience office was notified late in the game, the school district headquarters kept itself informed during the process of developing the regulations by telephoning ETA's Office of Youth Programs as well as education lobby groups in Washington, D.C. Unfortunately, headquarters staff did little to relay this information to the work experience unit that ultimately had to prepare the YETP proposal to CETA.

Aside from some last minute input from the Archdiosis (parochial schools), CBO's made little contribution to the planning process. Similarly the Youth Council, which is a subcommittee of the Manpower Planning Council, did meet to consider YETP, but they did not have enough time to make any substantive input. However, it should be noted that the Youth Council, which was formed under SPEDY and augmented under YETP, has been one of the most active committees of the Planning Council. In fact, it continued to meet even while the Planning Council was without a chairperson.

Given the short time frame to develop a proposal, it was fortunate that LAUSD had had long experience with MDTA and CETA, being virtually the only school district that the city had to deal with. The NYC program had operated in the schools for 13 years, and there were already Title I and SPEDY contracts between CETA and LAUSD. With this background and short time for planning, it is no wonder that what LAUSD proposed to do with YETP funds was quite similar to what it was doing with Title I and SPEDY funds.

The only planning problem experienced by the schools, aside from the short planning period, was the fact that the minimum wage was increased to $2.65/hour, making it necessary to reduce the expected number of participants. Planning problems experienced by the CETA youth office were that: (1) there was uncertainty about the interpretation of new regulations, making it necessary to avoid the regional office and contact Washington directly, and (2) there was no time to get appropriate input from CBO's, the Youth Council, or even the City Council. Perfunctory approval was given because there was nothing else that could be done.

Program Observations

Both the CETA youth office and the work experience staff of LAUSD saw YEDPA as an opportunity to expand work experience programs that were already in place for in-school and out-of-school youth. Despite the fact that some 2500 more youth could be served with the additional $6.9 million, both organizations felt it was a "drop in the bucket" and that much more money was needed to address adequately the youth employment problem.

Not much attention was paid by either organization to the quality or career relatedness of work experience under YEDPA, despite the law's intent to address this. There were several reasons. Both the CETA and school people were frustrated at not having sufficient time for planning. The school's work experience staff hardly knew what was in YEDPA, other than it was a separate line item in the budget, and the CETA youth programs staff felt so overworked and understaffed that they did not have the time to do serious programming with the schools. CETA staff were particularly irritated with the increasing number of CETA programs that required additional paperwork (to get grants) but with insufficient increase in staff. The CETA people felt that it was politically impossible to withhold the 22 percent setaside from the schools; the quality arguments (for withholding the school funds) just would not wash with either the City Council or the Mayor. Further weakening the CETA hand was the fact that for all practical purposes there was only one school district to deal with; hence, the possibility of having several school districts compete for scarce YEDPA funds was not an option. For the above reasons, then, the CETA/LEA agreement was more a compliance than a planning document. YEDPA during its first year had little impact on the quality of the work experience. Spending the money was the primary goal.

Traditional school policy for awarding academic credit was another important reason for the rather humdrum type of work experience offered. "Seat time" or attendance is the primary criterion for getting credit toward graduation, whether the student is in the classroom or in a work setting. Students in the work experience program get credit for reporting to work, regardless of the type of work. Co-op students in private industry may obtain credit for working in McDonald's (fast food service) or in a bank, and students paid with CETA funds can get credit for sweeping floors on LAUSD property. There is no requirement that work experience must be related to the academic program, nor that competencies derived from work experience must be submitted to a test for the purpose of

obtaining credit. Thus far, YEDPA has not affected these practices, other than to require that students paid with YEDPA funds obtain at least 15 hours of (career-oriented) related instruction.

Academic credit is one area targeted for attention in the next fiscal year, according to the local CETA Youth staff. CETA wants the schools to explore new ways of providing academic credit for competencies derived from work experience and to be more selective about the kinds of work for which credit will be given. Furthermore, the CETA staff is interested in having the CBO's work with the schools to provide academic credit for work experience obtained by both students and out-of-school youth.

Fortunately, the schools already have in place a procedure called "individual study" which could be utilized more to help students obtain credit for work experience. The student under this program can develop his or her own work experience program, including self-employment, and convince a teacher and career advisor that he or she has learned something worthy of academic credit. The teacher helps the student organize this experience and provides the needed academic supervision. The career advisor would be the school's liaison with the student's employer.

In addition to expanding participation in individual study, the provision of academic credit for competencies derived from work experience would be facilitated by some revisions in California State law. The present law stipulates that credit can be provided only to enrolled students by a certified teacher. Out-of-school youth cannot get school credit for work experience. The establishment (in law) of some alternative credentialing procedure to allow students and non-students alike to get school credit for competencies they can demonstrate, wherever they were derived, would be desirable from the standpoint of implementing the academic credit provisions of YEDPA.

Despite the rather poor quality of the work experience offered to many of the students and the fact that academic credit practices have not been changed to improve this, CETA school relations are perceived to be positive. During the early years of CETA, school personnel, who were irritated at having less influence than they did under MDTA, participated much less in CETA than they do now. Prior to 1976, only one CETA employee was assigned to school programs. Today, CETA has 3 contracts with LAUSD (Title I, SPEDY, and YETP) and some 6-7 professional staff to administer the in-school program.

Both CETA and LAUSD would be delighted to expand these programs and provide more jobs to youth. However, both groups believe that the passage of Proposition 13 to limit property taxes will frustrate any attempt to expand because of the inability to obtain sufficient personnel for supervision.

One CETA administrative practice that may contribute to the isolation of the schools from the rest of the community is the requirement not to permit a contractor to subcontract. Schools must spend their CETA funds on students and school personnel directly. Students paid out of CETA funds are considered as employees of LAUSD and work under the supervision of LAUSD staff. They cannot contract out certain services and youth jobs to community-based organizations (CBO'S) in the non-profit sector, and for insurance purposes, by decree of the superintendent's office, they cannot even place students in worksites other than those under the aegis of LAUSD. The rationale for this is to avoid lawsuits that may result from student accidents or behavior while working on the (CETA-subsidized) LAUSD payroll.

Two other factors which limit the capability of the schools to find jobs for CETA-eligible youth are busing and the distribution of CETA slots into 6 labor market areas. Because of the time lost in getting bussed to and from school, many eligible students cannot get back to their home neighborhood in time to participate in school-arranged work experience that normally takes place in the afternoon. Nor can these bussed students work in the neighborhood of their schools because of a City Council ordinance requiring CETA slots to be allocated only to those individuals who work in the same labor market area where they reside. Even if such an ordinance were not in effect, bussed students would still face the problem of how to get home if they worked in the afternoon.

To get out of this dilemma, school personnel suggested (a) abandoning the requirement to work in the same labor market area where one resides, (b) extending the school day to permit work experience in the morning as well as in the afternoon, which, in turn, would enable work experience students to take their academic classes in the afternoon, (c) providing transportation funds to bussed work experience students so that they could get to and from work, or (d) providing more flexible bus schedules to pick up students at different times. CETA youth office personnel were not terribly optimistic or supportive about changing the labor market area requirements or providing extra funds for student transportation.

The allocation of slots by labor market area presents yet another problem for planning, namely, the provision of jobs

to youths that need them the most, particularly during the summer. Some areas like Watts are continually oversubscribed with many more youths seeking jobs than the number available through CETA. Other areas like the San Fernando Valley have to scout around for eligible youth to fill the slots that have been allocated. Occasionally, unused slots will be returned to the CETA office for redistribution, but by the time this happens, employers have already made their summer hiring decisions and cannot take on more people. Because of the political advantages accruing to City Councilmen (e.g., showing constituents their ability to get Federally subsidized jobs for the district) it is unlikely that the allocation of slots by labor market area will be discontinued.

Issues and Impacts

In Los Angeles, YEDPA has not had much impact on the schools, other than to expand the kinds of CETA-supported work experience programs that were already in place and to provide more follow-up and jobs for 12th graders. The schools freely admitted this but indicated they had no time for planning and little information about YEDPA itself. Moreover, they felt program quality would have been improved if there were more dollars for supportive services and supervision of students engaged in work experience. School personnel indicated that they would do better planning and supervision if there were less Federal paperwork and administrative requirements. Two suggestions to cut down on these were to (a) write two-year (rather than one-year) contracts with CETA, and (b) allow all students to be eligible for CETA-supported work experience. In addition to lessening the time and effort spent in recruitment or intake, eliminating the economic criterion for eligibility would remove any stigma from participating in the program while probably not changing in any significant way the types of students currently served. Also, school personnel felt that all students, regardless of their family income, could benefit from work experience. Moreover, they felt that 9th and 10th graders should become more involved in work experience programs, inasmuch as these may be instrumental in preventing dropouts.

The major impact of YEDPA on the CETA organization itself was to increase their workload and staff. The Youth staff vigorously disagreed with separate categorical programs under CETA and saw no reason why YEDPA should not be consolidated under Title I employment and training programs. Consolidation, they felt would decrease paperwork and hence free them to work more closely with the schools in developing programs.

Both the CETA prime sponsor and the schools felt their problems could be solved by more money and staff. CETA personnel wanted more Federal dollars to provide their own technical assistance to schools and CBO's. Despite their favorable impression of the DOL/HEW regional workshops on YEDPA, they were not terribly excited about the prospects of getting more technical assistance from the Federal Government. They did, however, feel the need to do more traveling to conferences and demonstration sites and desired funds that would support such travel.

Neither administrative nor community participation arrangements were influenced much by YEDPA. CETA's linkages with the schools were well established prior to YEDPA and a youth subcommittee of the Planning Council was already functioning before the requirement under YEDPA to establish a Youth Council.

In summary, other than providing more money and jobs, YEDPA was not viewed as a new opportunity by either the CETA or school personnel. There was little effort or desire to be innovative with respect to creating quality career-type work experience with academic credit, nor were there any concerted efforts to improve management of the program by involving other teachers or volunteers. A variety of reasons were offered why things couldn't be any different--that the "system" just would not permit new structures, that there was too much red tape, and that other institutions would not respond. In short, CETA and school staff seemed comfortable with the current arrangements. Doing anything different just did not seem to be worth their effort.

GPO 931-812